DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 577 VT 019 695

TITLE	Region II National Dissemination Conference (Knoxville, Tenn., October 10-11, 1972).
INSTITUTION	Tennessee Occupational Research and Development Coordinating Unit, Knoxville.
PUB DATE	Oct 72
NOTE	30p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Clearinghouses; Communications; *Conference Reports; Educational Programs; Extension Agents; Extension Education; *Information Dissemination; *Information Needs; Information Networks; *Information Systems; Information Utilization; Resource Centers; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Educational Resources Information Center; ERIC; National Institute of Education; NIE; Region 2

ABSTRACT

A 2-day dissemination conference was held to provide opportunities for participants from eight states to share ideas concerning information dissemination and to discuss regional communication efforts. Presentations during the first day of the conference centered around the dissemination and communication efforts of the National Institute of Education (NIE) and programs sponsored by NIE, including the educational extension agents program, the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) system, and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education. The second day of the conference was devoted to a series of presentations concerning dissemination needs within the state education agency, on the university campus, and in the southeastern region. The conference was concluded with a group discussion of the feasibility of establishing an information system on a regional basis. Texts of the presentations concerning NIE and NIE-sponsored programs are included in this publication. A list of participants and conference schedules are appended. (SB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 075577

REGION II

NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE

October 10-11, 1972

Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit
College of Education
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

UT 019 695

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Conference Summary 3

New Dissemination Thrusts 5

Thomas D. Clemens, Director
Task Force for Field Initiated Studies
National Institute of Education
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D.C.

Educational Extension Agents 11

Charles Haughey
Dissemination Task Force
National Institute of Education
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D.C.

The Status and Future of ERIC 13

Harvey Marron
Dissemination Task Force
National Institute of Education
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D.C.

Vocational Education Dissemination Programs 21

Dr. Joel Magisos
Associate Director of Information Services
The Center for Vocational-Technical Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Appendices

Appendix A: Conference Participants 24

Appendix B: Conference Program 27

A GLANCE AT THE PAST

Region II of the National Dissemination Conference was, initially, an idea spawned in Summer 1970 in Raleigh, North Carolina. A small group of Southerners attending the first ERIC Tape Users Conference held a dinner meeting in a cow barn just outside Raleigh. States represented included North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Florida, Tennessee and one or two more. Also present were project officers from the U. S. Office of Education's Division of Dissemination.

While feasting on steak and refreshments, the talk was heavy with business; suddenly, thoughts began to zero in on an existing need for a more formal way in which one state might help another with dissemination problems or provide informational materials. OE spokesmen stated federal funds were not available for such an undertaking but that moral support would be given to any plan designed to improve dissemination.

Big talk was made about what we could do; small talk was made about who would do it. Educators cannot seem to function very well without a committee and that group of steak-eaters was no exception. Phil Boeple of Virginia suggested that Bob Hancock of Florida be named chairman. From that moment until May 1972, Region II was a non-existant region with an unofficial chairman.

The October 1972 conference in Knoxville gave birth to a full-fledged, organized Region II. Seven of the 10-member states sent representatives. Louisiana was placed in another region by the National Institute of Education. However, it sent a delegate to Knoxville and, upon a unanimous expression of the conference, was annexed into Region II.

During the National Dissemination Conference in Columbia, South Carolina in May 1972, Region II elected the following officers: Chairman Robert Hancock, Florida; Vice Chairman, Dr. Ed Ellis, South Carolina; and (approved) Secretary-Treasurer, Mrs. Dee Wilder, Tennessee.

Between May and August, the three officers gave thought to a Fall conference. What to offer was more important than where to hold it. A communication triangle was established between Columbia and Knoxville and Tallahassee. The first conference mailing was sent in August to State liaison persons in Region II.

The chairman is very much indebted to Dr. Gary Bice, director of the Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit, University of Tennessee at Knoxville, for extending an invitation to meet in Knoxville and for making available the services of his staff, including Mrs. Dee Wilder and Ms. Rella Hines. Mrs. Wilder was hostess for the two-day session and did a magnificent job of coordinating the activities. Dr. Ed Ellis, director of the Office of Research, South Carolina Department of Education, freely gave of his time and expertise, plus loaned the very capable Mrs. Jane H. Ness to Mrs. Wilder. Every chairman should have a Girl Friday like Mrs. Jeynean Porter of the Florida Educational Resources Information Center, Florida Department of Education. People such as Mrs. Wilder, Ms. Hines, Mrs. Ness, Mrs. Porter, Dr. Bice and Dr. Ellis make for good conference

planning and insure a successful meeting which, in some way, meets a need of each person who attends.

A summary of the presentations given by the conference speakers is included in this report. The impact of how they said what they said is missing; we could not capture that on paper. It was an informal, warm, friendly meeting in which communication between speaker and audience was excellent. As chairman, I was happy when the session adjourned; as a participant, I wondered why it had to end so quickly.

The final minutes were devoted to selecting new officers. They are Chairman, Dr. Gerald Klein, Georgia; Vice Chairman, Dr. Marshall Frinks, Florida; and (approved reappointment) Secretary-Treasurer, Mrs. Dee Wilder, Tennessee.

As Dr. Ellis and I step down from office and fade into the shadows, we do so with fond memories of those wonderful people who have been so kind, generous and helpful. Serving Region II during its infancy has been a never-to-be forgotten experience ... we wouldn't want it to be any different.

Robert E. Hancock, Chairman
Region II
National Dissemination Conference

CONFERENCE SUMMARY

The first Region II National Dissemination Conference hosted by the Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit was held at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville, October 10 and 11, 1972. Eight states were represented; in addition, there were three representatives from the National Institute of Education, one participant from New Mexico, and one from Ohio. The Conference program was designed to provide opportunities for participants to share ideas concerning information dissemination and to discuss regional communication efforts. The final report includes those presentations deemed most relevant to the objectives of the Conference.

Conference participants were welcomed by Dr. Garry R. Bice, Director of the Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit and by Dr. Archie R. Dykes, Chancellor of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. A description of the National Institute of Education and what it means to possible directions in dissemination was presented by Mr. Thomas D. Clemens, Director, Task Force for Field Initiated Studies, National Institute of Education.

The morning session ended with a presentation on the Educational Extension Agents Program given by Mr. Charles Haughey, Dissemination Task Force, National Institute of Education.

In the afternoon session, the Status and Future of ERIC was discussed by Mr. Harvey Marron, Dissemination Task Force, National Institute of Education. This was followed by an explanation of Vocational Education Dissemination Programs by Dr. Joel Magisos, Associate Director of Information Services, The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University.

The final afternoon presentation, Products and Activities of the Southwest Cooperative Educational Lab, Albuquerque, New Mexico, was given by Ms. Judy Anderson, Acting Director of Dissemination Installation, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

The Wednesday morning session began with a series of presentations concerning Dissemination Needs within the State Education Agency, on the University Campus, and in the Southeastern Region. These were given, respectively, by Dr. W. E. Ellis, Director, Office of Research, South Carolina Department of Education; Dr. James D. McComas, Dean, College of Education, University of Tennessee, Knoxville; and Mr. Robert E. Hancock, Administrator, Florida Educational Resource Information Center.

The Conference was concluded with a group discussion of the feasibility of establishing an information dissemination system on a regional basis. It was agreed that a Task Force consisting of the Executive Board of Region II would meet in December to further pursue this matter.

REGION II

NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE

PRESENTATIONS

REGION II

NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE

A Presentation by Thomas D. Clemens
The University of Tennessee
October 10, 1972

You will notice that I will be speaking from cards; the reason for that is to quiet these foul rumors that we Feds engrave our remarks in tablets of stone.

I am going to take the liberty today and not just talk about new thrusts and dissemination, but to talk with you about what this new thing called the National Institute of Education means with regard to possible directions in dissemination.

First, though, what I would like to do is to express Lee's very sincere regrets that he cannot be with you today. As you know, there have been a series of meetings around the country for State Agency Personnel with regard to new developments in Federal legislation. Lee has attended two of these and he is at a third one today bringing the message of improved dissemination services. He asked me to come here because he knows that in this room we have people who are already confident and committed to the area of dissemination. He felt that it was extremely important for him to carry the word to your colleagues back in other state agencies in order that it would be possible for them to provide you the support and the commitment which you will need to go on with your planning and your efforts to improve the utilization of knowledge for improved learning for our kids.

It goes without saying, I suppose, that we believe that you are to be heartily commended here in the Southeast on looking toward a regional organization. As you may know, the Northeast is making similar efforts and we believe that these . . . .have been demonstrated by state educational agencies in the Southeast. A second possible advantage of your kind of efforts is that you will have a way of exploring means of sharing resources on a regional basis so that the burden does not become too heavy for any one state and yet each state can have equal and improved access to the total knowledge base in education.

Third, by sharing your experiences, by up-rating perhaps from time to time, it will be possible to assure a kind of responsiveness of dissemination programs in state agencies and at the local level to the unique characteristics of each region. I suppose I am enough of a Jeffersonian to believe that we are a necessarily and properly diverse nation. The region, the natural region, provides a very useful vehicle for assisting states to assist themselves.

Finally, it seems to me that working on a regional basis you may have opportunities to help formulate and shape national policies with regard to research, development, dissemination, and utilization of knowledge that might not be possible if you work independently.

Let me now turn to what the status is on the National Institute of Education. Because this is potentially, I believe, one of the most significant developments in American education, perhaps since the Northwest Ordinance. I say that recognizing what the Northwest Ordinance did for education. First of all, let me run quickly over the mandate for NIE which perhaps you already know. Congress set a very difficult task or series of tasks. Congress started out in the bill by saying that NIE is to help alleviate or solve the problems of education. It goes on to suggest that to assert that NIE should advance the practice of education as an art, a science, and a profession. Third, Congress has charged us to strengthen the scientific and technical foundations of education, and finally, to build an effective research and development system for education. I need not tell you that part of that research and development system is a system for dissemination and utilization of knowledge.

How will the Institute work? According to the law there will be a director nominated by the President and endorsed by the Senate. Similarly, a National Education Research Council is to be nominated by the President and endorsed by the Senate. These will be the primary policy-making instruments. There are other interesting developments though which are almost unique in educational legislation in this country. First of all, the appropriations for the National Institute will not have to be spent completely within the year in which the money is appropriated. We then have no year money. Any funds which are appropriated are available for use until they have been obligated to researchers, state agencies, or others. As a consequence, you may not see the end of the fiscal year madness which has characterized our activities in Washington in the past. Ostensively, this will provide an opportunity for careful collaboration and planning which will permit funds to tie to the natural funding cycle within the schools, the natural budget cycles in the schools, rather than some kinds of arbitrary or even chance happenings such as when the appropriation bill passes, when some Fed gets a gas pain and it passes as inspiration or what have you.

Another significant element in the legislation is that up to 10% of all appropriated monies may be used for intramural research. This means that it will be possible in addition to simply making grants and contracts for the Institute to carry on research, particularly policy studies, which are best carried on in a sheltered setting in so far as the Washington setting can be sheltered.

Finally, the law authorizes that up to one-fifth of the total staff may be appointed without regard to civil service regulations. This means that it will make it possible for us to bring in on a short-term basis (up to three years) qualified practitioners, administrators, and scholars to work within the setting of the Institute itself, and perhaps bring an air of reality to the planning of the operations of the Institute which were never possible when our research authorization was in the Office of

Education. It also means that there can be the possibility coupled with the intramural research opportunity of competent people like you and your colleagues to make contributions to the college base within the setting of the Institute. It is very early in the development of the Institute for us. The current status is that there is no director, there is no council, there are no appropriations, and there are no regulations. All of these will very probably change by some time between now and January. I think I can assure you that it will be possible for proposals to be reviewed and projects funded some time around January or shortly thereafter depending upon when the appropriation is passed.

The early activities of the Institute will probably focus in about five areas or so. There will be a stronger emphasis on research than has been true in the past. There will be fairly heavy emphasis on directed programs focused upon national priorities. There will be, third, a strong emphasis on resource building, human resources, institutional resources, and methodological resources for improved research development and dissemination. There will be programs receiving special emphasis that relate to urgent national problems such as career education and experimental schools. Finally, and by no means of least importance, there will be a strong emphasis upon fostering the implementation of the results of research through the dissemination and utilization of knowledge.

At the present time we are engaged in housekeeping activities. We are monitoring literally hundreds, if not thousands, of projects transferred from the Office of Education into NIE. There are intensive planning efforts going on. We are attempting to arrange the transition of programs from other agencies into NIE. This is being done through a very flexible and interim organization in which we have a variety of task forces. There are, of course, the usual management and administrative task forces for housekeeping, budget preparation, etc. The task forces which are concerned about the business of education are the following ones. There is a Dissemination Task Force, the largest one in the Institute, and this task force is headed by Lee Burchinal. I am heading one called Field-Initiated Studies where any idea will have an opportunity to be judged on the basis of its scientific merits and its technical development without regard to any NIE priorities at all. There is a Task Force on Applied Studies which is attempting to identify those areas where directed research and development, the new efforts of NIE, should begin. Closely related to that is the Task Force on New Initiatives headed by Harry Silverman which is attempting to identify some places where NIE should maintain a presence for a number of years. It is focusing on problems like new means of providing services of higher education to its clientele, problems of new measurements and new methodology in education, and the problems of individually guided instruction.

Still another task force under Cory Reader is concerned with bringing off the work which has already been begun so well in the area of career education. Bob Benswienger continues to head a Task Force on Experimental Schools. Under John Edemeyer a small task force is charged with developing plans for the training of researchers (that research broadly defines as one of the major concerns of training, recruitment, and identification of personnel) for roles in dissemination utilization and implementation of the results of research. John has defined his mission even further and is looking at some of the problems of what kinds of institutions and mechanisms we need in addition to people to have an effective research and development system.

Finally, under Mark Tucker there is a small task force which is exploring how it is possible to bring about a transition of the programs of the regional educational laboratories and the R & D Centers into NIE. That is where we are and now you know about as much about NIE as I do.

I would like to return to where my personal commitment and heart lies, and that is dissemination. Part of the implications of this new legislation is this new organization for dissemination for us in this room. The first implication comes right out of the legislation itself and particularly from the committee report when the bill was passed and that is that there is a central role for the State Educational Agency in NIE's program. The committee report explicitly states, as does the debate on the floor of the House and Senate by the way, that NIE must look to State Educational Agencies as one of the mechanisms to translate the results of research into practice. A second charge in this legislation is that NIE must find ways to involve state educational agencies in identifying needs, defining problems, and formulating goals and priorities for research development and utilization.

Secondly, and this is perhaps a corollary of the first, there will be, subject to the availability of funds, an educational extension program started this year. Charles Haughey will have more to say to you about this. He is much more current on it than I am. There may be some modification, but the central concern right now is to make sure that the extension program can be operated as a kind of field experiment so that it is possible for states to systematically develop alternatives to the more classic program which has been emerged in South Carolina, Oregon, and Utah in order that we can have a better way of deciding how such a program can be tailored to the unique requirements of each state.

Third, and I think there is no doubt about this, within NIE there will be markedly increased opportunities for research and development on the process of dissemination and utilization in the Office of Education. Our charge in the National Center for Communication had to be stretched quite a bit for us to support any research at all. In NIE this will be one of the major emphases in the years to come.

A fourth kind of implication is, I believe, that very soon you will begin to see a wider range of information resources available to you and through you to local educators in assessing, weighing, trying, and hopefully, adopting or adapting new programs for improved school programs. We will continue to provide print materials (I think you will see more extensive use of non-print media including broadcast and I believe that you will see an increased emphasis upon visitation services) and technical assistance of a variety of sorts so that educators can have the range of resources they need to make more rational and effective decisions.

Fifth, and this relates not just to dissemination but to research and development efforts as well, I believe that you will see the priorities in programs of NIE based much more in the stated needs of the field than has been true in the past. There is a great deal of concern for needs assessment activity and for survey activity to identify perceived needs and related efforts.

Finally, I believe that you will find in NIE, and this is particularly germane to those of us concerned with dissemination, a great deal of active effort to link with the Office of Education and other agencies in order to implement the results of NIE research. There is no way that NIE can ever have tangible impact on teaching of teachers and learning of children unless the large money programs like Title I and Title II and a number of others which you are still administering by the Office of Education are brought to bear. That is why it is so important that the legislation also involves the appointment of an Assistant Secretary of Education who will be coordinating and establishing a policy for both of these, the Office of Education and for NIE. One of the things this means to me is that as you work the next couple of days, I hope that you will recognize the increased need for state educational agencies to collaborate among yourselves and with us in Washington for educational improvement at all levels in the schools and out of schools if possible. I would submit that regional organization of the states is a very viable approach to developing this interstate collaboration and may very well provide a mechanism for relating to the Federal Government. I might suggest four specific kinds of participation that the states might have in the efforts of NIE to improve education.

First of all, the state agency is in a marvelous position to provide input for policy planning and program development for NIE. This may be done by carrying on and communicating to us the needs assessment activities which are going on or should go on at both the state and the local level.

Secondly, the data from your evaluation studies and from the evaluation studies of the several locals provides another very valuable input for policy and program planning. What agency is in a better position to identify gaps in research as it relates to current practice than the state agency?

Finally, I think that the state can provide a great deal of assistance to us in identifying needs for the development of new instructional materials, new structural arrangements in education, and related outcomes of the development process which can be used by teachers and administrators in the future.

A way in which the state agency can participate effectively is through the direction and operation of dissemination and utilization programs. Now this is something I need not talk about in detail to the people in this room because all of you are about in it in one way or another. We believe that it is extremely important to continue the kind of state-Federal liaison which we have had in the Office of Education and which Ed Ellis and Jane Ness have so admirably handled through the various conferences in recent years. We think this liaison is, if anything, more important now than it was when we were in the Office of Education setting.

Secondly, of course, you can provide dissemination services, you can provide physical access to ERIC documents, to PREP, to the mini-kit, and to other products, dissemination products which are coming out of our program.

Third, state agencies can develop and demonstrate improved dissemination and retrieval technology. Some of the most imaginative kinds of batch search and interactive search activities which are going on in this country are going on not among the information science fraternities, but are going on in state educational agencies. We hope this continues.

Fourth, the state agencies can provide technical assistance and training to other staff and state agencies in dissemination and utilization strategy. Interested states, of course, can participate in the educational extension service. If interested, you might wish to consider adoption of the new copyright guidelines of the Division of Research. Let me digress for a moment and talk for a little bit about copyright. I suppose any of you who have anything to do with Title III or some of the other big money programs by now recognize as we do that one of the most effective ways of keeping the outcomes of these programs from having an impact upon others is to put those products in the public domain. That is why there was an Office of Education copyright program. That is why there is a Division of Research copyright program. I suggest that you write Morton Bachraugh who is the copyright authorization officer and NIE for a copy of these guidelines. At the present, they do not relate to state formula grant programs. However, the state does have the option of adopting or adapting these guidelines and benefiting from the use of the private sector in the future. I should caution you that at the present time there is also a new guideline by the Office of Management and Budget which is somewhat more restrictive than the Division of Research copyright guidelines are. I suggest that before making a decision with regard to copyright that you do correspond with Morton Bachraugh not just to get the guidelines, but also to have him explain and interpret to you the differences between the O and B position (Office of Management and Budget position) and that of the Division of Research.

REGION II

NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE

A Presentation by Charles Haughey
The University of Tennessee
October 10, 1972

Perhaps we should begin by talking for just a moment about the extension agent program in its new National Institute of Education context. The change to NIE is a matter of fact; and there are some observations that we can fairly make after three and a half months. One is that the impetus to continue the extension program remains strong. A second is that the change in NIE will bring about some noticeable shifts in emphasis.

Many of you are already familiar with the changes in emphasis. Because we are now part of a research agency, the program will be, in a major sense, an experimental program. While we were a part of the Office of Education, our intention was to test the utility of the extension concept, find evidence whether the extension agent was effective, and then develop the program to serve all the states. That long-run intention has not changed, but because we are a part of NIE and because we have more stringent responsibilities, our requirements now for validation are going to take an additional three to five years of program operation and testing before we put a stamp on this that says, "Yes, this definitely works in a specific fashion." The experimental program will involve a number of states. It will follow models, models that will be substantially suggested in the program announcements that we issue to solicit state participation. There will be an extensive evaluation contract which will represent a very major part of our program. It will set out from the beginning to gather information about what things are like out there where extension agents are going to work, and more importantly now, about what good extension agents are doing.

It is not possible today to predict when we will be able to issue program announcements, but our hope is that we will go to each chief state school officer sometime in the next several months with a bulletin inviting participation of each state in an extension program funding competition, and informing him that proposals will be received on a given date, which I am not going to try to predict today. Their proposals will have to conform to certain specifications, and I do not want to over-emphasize the bureaucracy of this. We expect to suggest three or four ways in which states can participate and we will hope that the states will then select the ways that they want to go.

There will be variables. They may be as minor as full-time versus part-time agents, as agents working in teams as opposed to agents working in a solitary manner. There may be some other variables with higher impact.

At this point there are so many things being considered and there are so many potential variables arising from the reports we have of the first year of the pilot program, that it would be just foolish of me to try to guess what kind of variables they may be.

The competition should start soon and we look to have a new program in operation perhaps by the end of this school year. Probably this year is going to have to be a tuning-up operation for getting people in place, getting them trained to some extent, but with major impact occurring next September and the coming school year.

REGION II

NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE

A Presentation by Harvey Marron
The University of Tennessee
October 10, 1972

I very much appreciate the opportunity to talk to you about what I would call the "nuts and bolts" part of the dissemination program. My assigned topic is ERIC, ERIC products, and computer programs. This is a very wide range of subjects and I'm trying to cover them. I will be roaming around but I will try to stay within the allotted time. If there are any questions, comments, or interruptions, please bring them up immediately because I am going to cover such a wide variety of subjects that we may never come back conveniently to whatever I was talking about when you had that comment or question.

Let's start with ERIC. Its new location is now in the National Institute of Education. What about it? Where do we go from here? In terms of the structure of the ERIC system, we will probably see some changes in the next several years, but they will not be dramatic, nor will they happen immediately.

For one thing, I think we will see the number of clearinghouses reduced. Presently we have 18 clearinghouses; and I think that, if our present planning goes, within the next year or so we will probably come down to about 16 clearinghouses. We want to move to fewer but more comprehensive clearinghouses than we have today. We think that will make for better management of the overall system, for more efficient technical operations, and allow us to be more capable of handling any fast-breaking efforts or any new subject areas that come on the scene. This is one of the current weaknesses of the ERIC system. We do not seem to be able to cope with new, fast-breaking subject or program areas that come upon the scene suddenly.

Also we have to increase the scope of some of the existing clearinghouses. There are some gaps right now which we think need covering. Some examples are Health/Physical Education, Fine Arts, Humanities, and the Theory of Learning. There are some of the areas which are not being covered adequately, and we would now like to include them in scopes of already existing clearinghouses. I am reasonably sure that we will <u>not</u> create clearinghouses for these new subject areas.

In terms of the ERIC clearinghouse and their contracting arrangements, we want to move toward three-to-five year contract arrangements which are renewable after that period on the basis of some competitive procedure. This will establish a number of things. It will give people who are on

the outside looking in a chance to bid on getting in the ERIC clearinghouse. We will not take it as a given that because an ERIC clearinghouse is being operated by a given institution, it has got some kind of God-given right to continue to operate that clearinghouse. We want to move into a kind of set-up where we give the other organizations that feel qualified to do so an opportunity to compete.

With the three-to-five year cycle, we also give NIE a chance to assess whether we want to continue a clearinghouse in this particular subject area. We should not take it as a given because we create a clearinghouse now in a given subject area that in five years there will be the same need for a clearinghouse as there was when it was created.

Now, as far as administrative location in NIE, how does it fit? At this time we really do not know. The issue is far from settled, as Charlie and Tom indicated this morning regarding the extension agent program. ERIC is somewhat in the same boat. We think it will continue pretty much the way it is going today, but we are not quite sure in what kind of administrative set-up it will be.

Question: In relation to the clearinghouses, do you ever see a special agency to be handling things that are produced by state agencies, or do you think state agencies should send them to ERIC Central and let them disperse, or should we send things to go into the system directly to clearinghouses?

Answer: The set-up we have now is that you can submit them in a number of ways to ERIC. You can send them directly to an ERIC clearinghouse, or you can send them to a contractor, now Leasco (but this contractor is now up for bid and we do not know if they will get the continuation), or you can send them to ERIC Central who in turn will send them to the appropriate clearinghouse. We far prefer the latter. We prefer an arrangement whereby everything that is coming into ERIC be sent to ERIC Central and they will put it into the pipeline there. The reason we want that is not so much for this audience but for those who are far less initiated on what ERIC is and what it is about. Back in the early days, we used to ask people to send material to the most appropriate clearinghouse. Then we ran into all kinds of problems. What is the most appropriate clearinghouse? If one has a document which deals with the disadvantaged in reading, which clearinghouse should I send it to? There were occasions when we felt that we were not getting a lot of materials because what we were doing was placing the decision on the sender as to where to send it, and it was a pain in the neck. So we chose the easy way out, perhaps the coward's way out. We said don't make any decisions; send it to ERIC Central, and we will see to it that it gets into the right clearinghouse's hands (the right subject area). Now what the clearinghouse does with it is up to that clearinghouse. It may decide to discard it, it may decide to put it in for limiting processing, and may decide to put it in RIE.

Question: Is there any obligation of that clearinghouse to notify the original sender that his document has been received by the clearinghouse and will be considered?

Answer: No, there is no obligation. The reason for that is that it is such a terribly expensive procedure to do that. Several problems come up. Whom do you notify? Do you notify the people who sent it to you or do you notify the originator of the document? At what point do you notify them? Do you notify them that you have received it? Do you notify them that you have accepted it and that it is going to be input into RIE? If you look at all the permutations and combinations, it turns out to be a terribly expensive and a big bookkeeping job. So what we have done again is take the coward's way out at Central ERIC and said to the clearinghouses, "do the best you can." If you think and if you can handle the notification processing by all means do it. We think it is a great thing to do, but we are not going to force you to do it.

Question: But what about even if you just had a three-lined mimeographed sheet saying that your article has been received and will be considered?

Answer: The act of typing out an envelope, even putting a form letter in there saying your article has been accepted or rejected, is in itself a very expensive procedure. What we would like to suggest is a system whereby if the inputter is interested in being informed as to what is going to happen, that they enclose a self-addressed postcard. All we have to do is write and say we do accept or we do not accept or we will do this or we will do that. Now we can do something with that.

Let's move on to the ERIC products and services. The NIE, among other things, is re-examining its total position with respect to information analysis products. This will certainly have an impact upon the products being generated by the clearinghouses now. I have to also admit that we do not know what that policy is going to be. So I can only tell you that when NIE does develop some kind of uniform policy regarding information analysis products, that of course will be promulgated to the ERIC clearinghouses, that we will live with these policy issues.

Regarding Current Index to Journals in Education, we are moving into coverage for the foreign journals. These are not English-speaking foreign journals, but the non-English speaking foreign journals with emphasis on Western Europe. We already have included or are including (I'm not sure what stage it is in) 30 journals which are not English and we will soon follow with some more. What we will do there is include in CIJE not an annotation but a full abstract in English for the article being covered. It will be indexed according to the ERIC terms and, as before, we will not be able to provide any hard copy or microfiche in the full text. You will have to get those journals just like you do now. We will have references to the foreign literature.

On microfiche we expect very shortly to move to a 24-to-1 format which means 98 pages on one microfiche which is exactly the same size as the microfiche you have now (4" x 6"). This will give us a number of distinct advantages or credits. One, you get more pages per fiche and you end up with fewer fiche for a given document collection. This saves you 20% handling time, 20% filing time, and 20% file space. You will be able to read them very nicely; we have done this with your present 18-to-20-to-1 readers. These are the ones that you are now using to read your current

microfiche. The only problem that you may have (and we run into this a little bit) is if you have fiche which is marginal at 20-to-1, it will be even more marginal in terms of readability at 24-to-1. If you have something that is reasonably readable at its present magnification rate, it will still be quite readable at 24-to-1. The reasons for our doing this are numerous, but mostly because 24-to-1 has become the Government standard for microfiche in this area in scientific and technical literature dissemination. There is no question in my mind and in everybody's mind that in the near future all of the microfiche coming out of the Government in scientific and technical publications will be ERIC Document Reproduction Service materials getting there sooner, in fact, even on time in some cases. The reason I am so well adjusted and happy is that I get very few people brickbatting me all over the place as I go out to meet them. In general, is there anybody here still not getting good service out of the ERIC Document Reproduction Service? (silence) What a relief that is!

Question: Regarding Research in Education, CIJE, AIM, and ARM, on such an index file do we have a symbol which tells us which document is not available?

Answer: I do not know exactly what we will do, but what we are trying to do is to look at the computer program to generate a computer program so that next to each entry in the back of RIE each ED number (if the document is not available on microfiche or from EDRS) has a notation or something is put there.

Question: What's the problem?

Answer: I instructed the people to look into the computer program quite a while ago and, as usual, they come back and they say it's very difficult. I say "how difficult" and they say "very difficult."

Comment: About a year ago, back in January, they gave a listing of not available documents in RIE.

You did get a listing on a cumulative basis that is in the tapes that we are now disseminating. Quite apart from that, I am trying to get it so that we can enter it right into RIE, a somewhat difficult job. What more can I say, we are trying.

Now there are some new CCM products which you should be aware of, if you are not, that are announced and are on the market. I know I have my set of (I do not know if they are commercially available) ERIC abstracts covering the years 1968, 1969, 1970, and 1971. If any of you have tried to go back and buy from the Government Printing Office the past issues of RIE, you will learn that you cannot get them--they are out of print. So we have encouraged CCM to take all of those (just the abstracts--not the indexes) and bind them into one volume and sell them. I am not sure what the prices are; I think it is about $30 a volume, but you can now buy the abstracts to all of the ERIC reports to RIE going back to 1968. There was a previous volume published and available for the 1967 issues and for the two issues that appeared in 1966.

CCM is also putting out indexes to each of these cumulative volumes of abstracts. Now, I am not quite sure at this point how they are breaking the indexes, but they are making them cumulative. I do not know if they are

going to make it 1968 and 1969 in one volume or 1968, 1969, and 1970 in one volume. I have a hunch that the 1968 and 1969 cumulative index are in one volume and 1970 and 1971 are in another volume. In any case, you can get the abstracts as well as the indexes in cumulative volumes.

CCM continues to prepare micro-libraries. The indexes are in the format of RIE and are packaged with the microfiche in the reports cited. These micro-libraries sell for about $400. In reading, for example, for $400 one buys an index to all of the reading documents in the ERIC files between certain dates and the accompanying microfiche for those reports which were included. The Crowell, Collier, and MacMillan Company is going to sell another one in the area of library sciences and they hope to make available for sale in January. They are also preparing one in the social sciences and hopefully that will be ready in March of 1973. I do not think it is going to be of any use to all of your organizations that have the full ERIC collection because in a sense all it does is duplicate the material you have in your files. What it does give you is a separate index which you can purchase for about $10 or $15. The microfiche will, of course, be a direct duplicate of something you already have in your file. For those organizations who are heavily oriented in a subject area and who do not want to invest in a full microfiche collection, this might suit their needs very nicely.

Question: Is this something they are developing in response to RFP's or is this something they want to promote?

Answer: This is purely an investment of risk capital on their part. They are taking what is effectively public domain material and investing their own capital. There is no Office of Education or NIE support whatsoever. We want them to come out with something that sells because the more they do, the less we have to do. Many of the things they have done have turned out to be money makers, not wild money makers, but money makers. One of the things they have turned out has not turned out to be a money maker, and that was a selective dissemination of information in reading called CLASS reading. It turned out to be a failure and they dropped it.

We want to continue our work with the private sectors in developing new products for a number of very selfish reasons. Number one, it conserves our ERIC funds. You may or may not know this, but to get Research in Education printed we have to take ERIC monies and give it to the Government Printing Office. The Government Printing Office turns around and sells it and they keep the money or they turn it back to the Treasury and say, "Look what a good boy am I." Also, we have very little control over something when it goes to the Government Printing Office. As those of you who have tried to do business with the Government Printing Office know, it is a big, sprawling, sometimes very impersonal, sometimes very difficult organization. If we can get one of the private sector organizations to pick up and develop any of these publications, we think that is great. Generally, they end up by charging more money that the Government Printing Office would have done. On the other hand there are some gains in the balance. The Government is not involved in subsidizing a particular publication. Also, the private sector does a better job. They work harder at getting a quality product out. If it sells, they will make money. If it doesn't they are going to lose money, and they do not want to lose money.

So, in general, if you take them on as a partner as we have done in the past, we have found them to be hardworking and earnest about turning out a good product.

Question: Are you suggesting that we take RIE and have it printed privately?

Answer: We have considered it a great deal. It turns out, however, that there are many problems associated which make us pause and reflect. It is still under a close review.

I would like to just mention a few other things and then go on to talk about some studies that were performed on ERIC. We would like to increase the availability of some of the reference tools, not so much to the public at large, but to the people in the information center who have a need for quicker access to the files. For those of you who may be interested in the descriptor and the identifier frequency counts which have been available on a very limited basis from the Leasco Corporation, Crowell, Collier, and MacMillan (again as a risk venture) are taking this and putting them out in published form, hopefully around October or November. They will come out with two volumes that will sell for about $30. All of you who are familiar with them, and those who are not should be, know they are very handy tools in determining just what is available in the total ERIC file. Under any identifier and under any descriptor you have a count of the number of items which have been indexed to that term and then later on in another part of the volume you have the specific ED or EJ numbers listed. It is a nice inverted file to work with for a quick scan. These should be available shortly and will be in two separate volumes. We will keep the identifier and the descriptor separate.

Question: Will this Thesaurus continue to be published every two years?

Answer: I think we are going to move them to an every year operation. The problem here is one of economics. There are not that many new descriptors being created, really, to almost justify a new Thesaurus every year. On the other hand, there are enough to warrant reasonably frequent publication. I really do not feel too strongly about it, but I would prefer to see one every year.

Question: How many clearinghouses, other than the Clearinghouse for Exceptional Children, publish their own Thesaurus?

Answer: I don't know of any. If any of you get wind of these, let me know and we will try to publicize these in either ERIC Management Notes or in other ways.

Incidentally, the other thing I want to tell you about is a title index to all of the items in RIE and CIJE. We have had very limited distribution on that for this reason: it is difficult and expensive to generate and we are not quite sure what the demand is. If you think you would like to have a title index which is strict computer printout of everything in the ERIC files arranged alphabetically by the first non-trivial word in the title, it can be made available at a price. I don't know what it is going to cost (about $30-$40), and it will be computer printout.

Also, one more item is in the works which is worth noting. We are currently preparing selective dissemination of information scheme. We have picked 15 or so selected topics in education and are going to make a run against quarterly issues of the ERIC tapes in these subject areas. We will package and disseminate them to all ERIC microfiche standing order customers and other select sites. Your comments on these publications will be solicited.

There are three studies concerning ERIC that I want to briefly cover: (1) an evaluation of the ERIC products and services by the University of Indiana, (2) an evaluation study of the National Center for Education Communication Information Analysis Products done by the System Developing Corporation, and (3) a study of possible file partitions of ERIC also done by System Development Corporation.

The study on the University of Indiana is in the ERIC system in five volumes, ED 060 922, 3, 4, 5, and 6. In short, the study revealed that the ERIC materials are being used in substantial numbers. Although the usage is variable over the various groups in education and the products themselves, the essence of the findings are contained in the summary volume ED 060 922.

Now, let's move on to the SDC study of NCEC products. Basically, what the SDC people tried to do is to determine from a cross-section of educators their familiarity with and judgments on the quality and the utility of the NCEC products and to assess a survey methodology for continuing evaluation of the NCEC product. They sent out four questionnaires. One: a general screening device to identify which users knew about the NCEC products. Two: a user evaluation questionnaire to obtain those who had seen the ERIC products evaluation of the NCEC materials. Three: a non-user questionnaire to obtain information from the non-user about why he doesn't or why he didn't. Four: a specialist evaluation questionnaire which solicited comments on the work and the materials from subject specialists in a particular area. The first and second questionnaires were aimed at the general educational population, and the third and fourth questionnaires were aimed at the subject experts. Here are the major findings: (1) 87% of the respondents to the first questionnaire (the general questionnaire) reported familiarity with at least one NCEC product, (2) non-users showed high interest in NCEC products but found them difficult to obtain, and (3) the overall evaluations of coverage of topics (thoughtfulness, organization, clarity, format usefulness, etc.) in the bibliography were definitely positive. In better than 50% of the cases, specialists rated NCEC products in the good to excellent categories. Readers report that NCEC samples close to very useful in comparison to other products of the same type. NCEC products are having an impact on (1) specific problem solving and (2) information transfer. Interestingly, SDC found no correlation between high effort products and high quality rating. The report of the work is in ERIC as ED 067 520.

Let's move to the SDC study of the file partition. Essentially, the question they researched was: Is there some way we can break up the ERIC files, in a non-subject way, so that we can satisfy different groups within the educational community? They recommended that we not do a full partition

at this time, but instead consider doing a very limited experiment on selected dissemination of information. For a more indepth review of their findings and recommendations, we should read the full report.

Now, moving to computer search activities, there has really been a dramatic increase in the number of activities performing mechanized searches of the ERIC and other machine readable data bases. State and local dissemination units have a variety of options available on obtaining searches of the ERIC files on a fee for service basis or installing an inservice activity to perform these searches directly. A list of these installations has been distributed but will be updated from time to time.

Moving to On-Line Interactive Searching, there are two systems that are available if you can afford them. One is the Lockheed System - DIALOG, and the other is SDC's - ORBIT. While they are essentially similar, there are notable differences which must be studied and evaluated from your point of view. Full information for each software package can be obtained from the appropriate vendor.

The present ERIC network of DIALOG terminals which we are supporting under the National Institute of Education contract with the Lockheed Corporation consists of six terminals and there soon will be seven. The four terminals that we are supporting with NIE funds are at Federal Office Building 6 in Washington, D.C., the Washington, D.C. Public School System, RISE (Research and Information Services to Education) in Pennsylvania, and the San Francisco Office of Education Regional Office. There are two terminals that are being supported with their own funds. One is the Center for Exceptional Children in Arlington, Virginia, and the other is in the San Mateo Information Center in California (this is the one being directed by Frank Mattis). We will very shortly have a seventh terminal paid for out of local funds in the New Jersey State Department of Education in Trenton. These terminals are on two hours a day, five days a week, 52 weeks a year. At San Mateo the traffic has gotten so heavy that they have upped their usage to four hours a day.

There is no question about the fact that currently there are expensive systems. On the other hand, I think they will play a very important part in our future capabilities in information centers. I think we ought to stay with these new gadgets and try to learn as much as we can about them.

REGION II

NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE

A Presentation by Joel H. Magisos[1]
The University of Tennessee
October 10, 1972

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education is an integral component of The Center for Vocational and Technical Education at The Ohio State University. The Center and Clearinghouse are mutually supportive in missions and, together, have endeavored to develop a linked information dissemination system for vocational and technical education.

The mission of the Center is to strengthen the capacity of state educational systems to provide occupational education consistent with individual and societal needs. It is multidisciplinary approach, inter-institutional in program, comprehensive in commitment, and national in scope. Its operating divisions are R & D Operations, Information Services, and Special Projects and Field Services. R & D programs are operated in management systems, personnel development, instructional systems design, vocational development and adjustment, and diffusion strategies. Information Services include the ERIC Clearinghouse, supportive information for the comprehensive career education model, research library, Center product utilization, and several small projects. The Special Projects and Field Services Division has responsibility for the school-based comprehensive career education model, a large project involving several sub-contractors and six local education agencies.

The mission of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational Education is to acquire, select, abstract, index, store, retrieve, analyze, and disseminate research and related materials in vocational and technical education and the related fields of industrial arts education, manpower economics, occupational psychology, and occupational sociology. The Clearinghouse makes weekly inputs to Research in Education and Current Index to Journals in Education. It produces 30 information analysis papers annually. With the Center, it publishes Abstracts of Instructional Materials (AIM) and Abstracts of Research Materials (ARM).[2,3] Also, it prepares computer tapes of the AIM and ARM collections and repackages abstracts in targeted versions. The Clearinghouse provides user services to priority users and makes referrals to state research coordinating units were first enabled by provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Many RCU's were underway by 1965 and the dissemination role was conceptualized at a Center-sponsored conference in 1967. Linkage between the ERIC Clearinghouse and users was to be emphasized, in addition to linkages with national information systems and other systems in the states. An ad hoc committee of RCU personnel was formed to develop guidelines for RCU information programs. A preliminary version of a guide-book was developed. The committee recommended that the Center and Clearing-house conduct a pilot program, user study, and training workshop.

Subsequently, seven states were involved in a pilot program which involved meetings, visitations, a target audience study, and workshop planning. The target audience study was of over 3,200 users in seven categories in the cooperating states. Training workshops were conducted at Columbus and Denver for 33 RCU information specialists from 26 states. The Guide for State Vocational-Technical Education Information Dissemination Systems was published.[4] Subsequent to the study, a user training package was developed and is currently under test. Center-sponsored studies are underway of the information problems and needs of state and local vocational education directors. An information resources profile has been developed for each of the 50 states and will be used to promote further development and to facilitate referrals.

The current status of information dissemination activities in the RCU's is promising. Manual searches are being conducted for users in 28 states. Twenty-four RCU's conduct computer searches. ERIC microfiche collections are available for use in 34 states and many RCU's duplicate microfiche and paper copies for users. At least one regional organization has stepped in to provide services where insufficient resources have prevented development of RCU's. Decentralization of services into area vocational schools and community colleges is a trend. Needed is linkage with education-wide information systems.

Results of the target audience study are reported in a Center publication.[5] The findings indicated a need for better local resources. Users were spending 16 hours per month searching for information. Many were unfamiliar with ERIC, but 85% were willing to be trained in its use. Users wanted relevant, current, speedy, and brief information. Most services were too slow. Few differences were found between states. Recommendations of the study included development of training packages, more local information resources, targeted access products, a wide range of speedy service, and more study. The Center and Clearinghouse are acting on the recommendations.

---

[1]Joel H. Magisos, Associate Director, Information Services Division, The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus.

[2]Abstracts of Instructional Materials in Vocational and Technical Education. Columbus: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University. Published quarterly and available by subscription ($11 per year; $18, two years; $27, three years).

[3]Abstracts of Research Materials in Vocational and Technical Education. Columbus: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University. Published quarterly and available by subscription ($11 per year; $18, two years; $27, three years)

[4]Taylor, Celianna I. and Joel H. Magisos. Guide for State Vocational-Technical Education Information Dissemination Systems. Columbus: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, 1971.

[5]Magisos, Joel H. Interpretation of Target Audience Needs in the Design of Information Dissemination Systems for Vocational-Technical Education. Columbus: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, 1971.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

REGION II

NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE

List of Participants

Miss Judy Anderson
Acting Director of Dissemination Installation
Southwest Cooperative Educational
Laboratory (SWCEL)
Albuquerque, New Mexico
Phone: (505) 265-9561

Dr. Garry R. Bice, Director
Research Coordinating Unit
909 Mountcastle Street
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Phone: (615) 974-3338

Mr. Thomas D. Clemens, Director
Task Force for Field Initiated Studies
National Institute of Education
U. S. Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20202
Phone: (202) 962-6346

Dr. Archie R. Dykes, Chancellor
110 Administration Building
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Phone: (615) 974-3288

Dr. W. E. Ellis, Director
Office of Research
1203 Rutledge Office Building
South Carolina Department of Education
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
Phone: (803) 758-2169

Dr. Marshall Frinks
Associate for Planning and Coordination
Florida Department of Education
Miles-Johnson Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
Phone: (904) 599-5768

Dr. David Gabehart
West Virginia Department of Education
Capitol Building
Charleston, West Virginia 25305
Phone: (304) 348-2699

Mr. Robert E. Hancock, Administrator
Florida Educational Resource Information Center
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
Phone: (904) 488-2986

Mr. Charles Haughey
Dissemination Task Force
National Institute of Education
U. S. Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare
Washington, D.C. 20202
Phone: (202) 962-6346

Ms. Rella Hines
Research Assistant
Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit
909 Mountcastle Street
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Phone: (615) 974-3338

Dr. Gerald Klein
Projects Coordinator
Division of Program and Staff Development
320 State Office Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334
Phone: (404) 656-2556

Dr. Joel Magisos
Associate Director of Information Services
The Center for Vocational-Technical Education
The Ohio State University
1900 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Phone: (614) 486-3655, Ext. 212

Mr. Harvey Marron
Dissemination Task Force
National Institute of Education
U. S. Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare
Washington, D.C. 20202
Phone: (202) 755-7739

Mrs. Mary Marshall, Director
Division of Dissemination
Office of Planning
Kentucky Department of Education
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
Phone: (502) 564-3533

Dr. James D. McComas, Dean
College of Education
212 Claxton Education Building
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Phone: (615) 974-2201

Mr. B. Clark Meadows
Director of Instruction
Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219
Phone: (615) 741-2197

Mr. Walter E. Miller, Research Associate
Alternative Educational Practices
Florida State Department of Education
Miles-Johnson Building
111 W. Jefferson Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
Phone: (904) 599-5703

Mrs. Alice Morgan
Research Associate
Alabama Research Coordinating Unit
115 Petrie Hall
Auburn, Alabama 36830
Phone: (205) 826-5320

Mrs. Jane Ness
Education Information Analyst
Office of Research
South Carolina Department of Education
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
Phone: (803) 758-3548

Dr. Charles M. Peccolo, Director
Bureau of Educational Research and Services
213 Claxton Education Building
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Phone: (615) 974-2272

Mrs. Ann K. Stewart
Coordinator of Federal Programs
Louisiana State Department of Education
P. O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804
Phone: (504) 389-5769

Mrs. Dee Wilder
Information Specialist
Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit
909 Mountcastle Street
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Phone: (615) 974-3338

REGION II
NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10

****

8:00 - 8:45	Registration - Coffee and Doughnuts
8:45 - 11:30	*Dr. Garry R. Bice*, Presiding
8:45 - 9:00	Welcome to the University of Tennessee *Archie R. Dykes, Chancellor*
9:00 - 10:30	New Dissemination Thrusts *Thomas D. Clemens*
10:30 - 10:45	Break
10:45 - 11:45	Educational Extension Agents *Charles Haughey*
11:45 - 1:00	Lunch, Executive Dining Room Room 208
1:00 - 5:00	*Dr. W. E. Ellis*, Presiding
1:00 - 2:30	The Status and Future of ERIC *Harvey Marron*
2:30 - 3:45	Vocational Education Dissemination Programs *Dr. Joel Magiscs*
3:45 - 4:00	Break
4:00 - 5:00	Products and Activities of the Southwest Cooperative Educational Lab, Albuquerque, New Mexico *Miss Judy Anderson*

REGION II
NATIONAL DISSEMINATION CONFERENCE
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11

****

8:00 - 8:30	Coffee and Doughnuts
8:30 - 12:00	*Mrs. Dee Wilder*, Presiding
8:30 - 9:00	Dissemination Needs Within the State Education Agency *Dr. W. E. Ellis*
9:00 - 9:30	Dissemination Needs on the University Campus *James D. McComas, Dean*
9:30 - 10:00	Dissemination Needs of the Southeastern Region *Robert E. Hancock*
10:00 - 10:15	Break
10:15 - 11:30	Small Group Discussion: Southeastern State Target Audience Study
11:30 - 11:45	Group Summaries
11:45 - 12:00	Formation of Planning Committee for Target Audience Study
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch (on your own)
1:30	Individuals Are Invited to Tour the Research Coordinating Unit at 909 Mountcastle Street